

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-9, 11, 12 and 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069411A1 (Raineville et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,175,623 (Jenison). Claims 2, 3, 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,333,762 (Yoo et al.). Claims 14 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,527 (Lee). Claims 4, 10 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,625,764 (Tsujimoto).

Response to Arguments

The Examiner states that Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. However, Applicant notes that these rejections, although different from the previous Office Action rejections (§ 112 rejections), are the same rejections asserted in a previous Office Action dated June 3, 2005. Further, Applicant notes that the Examiner failed to address arguments submitted by Applicant against these rejections in Applicant's Amendment filed October 3, 2005. This does little to help further prosecution of the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 7-9, 11, 12 and 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville et al. in view of Jenison. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of these references in Applicant's previously filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 11 and 17, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, a given number of bits of the video signal from the second video process part being selected and presented in order of significance level thereof, superimposing a video signal by adding bits of the video signal from the first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part, or adding bits of a video signal of the main picture in reverse order of significance level thereof with bits of a video signal of the PIP selected and presented in order of significance level thereof according to the adjusted mix ratio. The Examiner admits that Raineville does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Jenison discloses these limitations in Fig. 1, col. 1, line 56 through col. 3, line 38. The Examiner here has cited the entire disclosure of Jenison including the summary and the entire detailed description except for the last paragraph. The Examiner is reminded that under 35 U.S.C. §103 law, the Examiner is required to specifically point out where in a cited reference it is alleged that each and every claim

limitation is disclosed or suggested. This is an improper rejection under any section of the patent laws.

In any event, the cited portions in Jenison merely disclose a video mixer that processes two video input signals and switches between bits of these two video input signals based on the value of a digital control signal to output one of the video input signal bits. This is not superimposing a video signal by adding bits of the video signal from the first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting parts, as recited in the claims of the present application. Jenison merely discloses using a digital control word to control switches selecting different bits of two video input signals. Jenison does not disclose or suggest anything related to adding bits of the video signal in reverse order of significance level thereof with the other video signal bits.

Jenison discloses that a bit may be selected between two video signal bits of a same significance level for each level of significance, so as to mix the two video signals. Therefore, Jenison can not disclose or suggest displaying the most significant bits (MSBs) of both video signals at a same time. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application disclose adding bits of the video signal of the first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part, therefore allowing the possibility of displaying the most significant bits of both video signals simultaneously. Therefore, Jenison does not overcome the deficiencies of Raineville et al.

Jenison merely discloses using a digital signal control word to control switches selecting different bits of two video input signals.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 12 and 18, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent upon one of independent claims 7, 11 and 17 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 7-9, 11, 12, 17 and 18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of Yoo et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 11 and 17 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Yoo does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Raineville and Jenison.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2, 3, 13 and 19 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 14 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of Lee. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 11 and 17 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Lee does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Raineville and Jenison.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 14 and 20 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 4, 10 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Raineville in view of Jenison and further in view of Tsujimoto et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 7 and 11 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Tsujimoto does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Raineville and Jenison.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 4, 10 and 15 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. 09/989,462
Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2006

Docket No. K-0348

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK/FDB:knv
Date: August 15, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610